

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

PAULA SUE SHOTWELL,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 09-2754-STA-dkv
)	
CITY OF MEMPHIS,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO AMEND SCHEDULING ORDER TO
EXTEND DISPOSITIVE MOTION DEADLINE**

Before the Court is Defendant’s Motion to Amend the Scheduling Order to Extend the Dispositive Motion Deadline (D.E. # 35), filed on May 4, 2012. For the following reasons, Defendant’s Motion is **DENIED**. Plaintiff’s Motion fails to comply with the Local Rules. More specifically, Plaintiff’s Certificate of Consultation does not conform to the requirements of Local Rule 7.2(a)(1)(B), which requires actual consultation between the parties, not a mere attempt. Under this Rule, “[t]he burden will be on counsel filing the motion to initiate the conference upon giving reasonable notice of the time, place[,] and specific nature of the conference.” Failure to comply with this rule may be deemed good grounds to deny the motion.

Here, Counsel for Defendant states that she attempted to consult with Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, on Friday, May 4, 2012, the same day she filed her Motion. Defendant’s Counsel was unable to reach Plaintiff. The Court finds that unsuccessful attempts to confer do

not satisfy the requirements of the Local Rules. Therefore, the Motion is **DENIED** without prejudice to re-file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. THOMAS ANDERSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: May 7, 2012